Apl F. IX-4

1927-28

File No. 66-7

Previous References

Serial Nos. 1-6

Later References

Preserved

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 6

Part B for Jany 1929

SUBJECT

Suit by Rapanna against the Govt.
re. his Chattram tenure at Mupparaka
Hobli Taluk

1 The Civil Judge Bangalore
No. 10.588 14.8.28
to whom this original with the enclosures

B.A. Sivaiyar
17.1.29

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 192

D 418 | Serial No. 6

From the Distt Judges Court, Bangalore
Dr no. XX 515 dt 1/10/27

Forwards Defendant Summons in duplicate to be served on the Ch Secry, in original suit No 2 of 27-28

This is in respect of a suit filed by Anantaramiah in respect of his claim to the chattram at Mugavalu. Mug file no 266 of 26 containing the endt no. 1994 dt 14-6-27 issued to him from the Mug: Deptt is put up. His claim was rejected by Govt.

The summons signed by the Ch: Secry. A draft reply to the Dt Court this Summons served is put up. After this is done the file may be sent to the L Law secretary for instructing the Public Prosecutor to take necessary action in the matter.

The summons may be signed this file will then be sent to Law Secy again

MD
15/10

Ch Secy
Hon' Law Secy

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0324—GPB—60,000—24-5-27

Done & sent to Law Secy
11/10
MD 11/10

1-918-27

(App. III—2)

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. — of 192

Serial No.

To the Distt Judge, Bangalore

Letter no., Camp 13/Mis. dt. 11/10/27.
original of
Returns the Summons duly served

in favour of next within

Mis
11/10

Law Secy

draft of pair subd. requesting P.P. Bangalore to take necessary action in conformity with Immgn Com.
Mblk
11/10/27.

Issued Camp no 88/P dt 11-10-27
to P. P.

Issued Camp no 88 A to
Immgn Com. dt 11-10-27

P.A
17/10

This has to be kept with Law 660 of 27

mf
14/12

Deposit

Ack

8/1/29

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0324—GPB—60,000—24-5-27

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

NOTES.

File No. 66

FILE HEADING.

Suit by Rajamma against the Govt. regarding the chattram building at Nuguvala Hoskote Taluk

FROM

The Public Prosecutor

No. Dated 23-5-28 Received 28-5-28

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare copies	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

Sends draft written statement for approval

NOTES AND ORDERS.

The P.P. sends a draft written statement in the above suit O.S. 2 of 27-28 in the Munsif Court, Bangalore with the connected records for approval and signature of the 1st deft viz Chief Secretary. It seems the case is posted 1-6-28 The copy of the plaint is not sent from a perusal of

NOTES—First Sheet.

O.S. 20/27. & Dtel.

5745

App. F. [III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. Case File No. 66 of 1927

4

Serial No.	
	the Statement & the records sent, the suit seems to be one for possession of a chattram on the allegation that it is the private property of Abbt & his ancestors. This position is denied in the defence & a plea of the suit being barred under sec 21 of the Hyderabad Regn (Religious charitable Endowments Regn ?) is raised
	Submitted MMP 25-5-28
	Typed Statement submitted MMP 26/5/28 (Chief Secy)
	Draft letter to Pr submitted. MMP 28/5/28
2	To the Public Prosecutor Dop 70 77 & 28/5/28. Returns the written statement duly signed
3	Letter dated 18.7. from the Supt, Bangalore forwarding a Prohibitory notice to be served on the Chief Secretary

appd. Type & send it after obtaining Ch. Secy's Signature 25/07

MMP 26/5

CHIEF SECRETARY, 26 MAY 1928

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0324—GTD—60,000—24-5-27

478

O.S. 2 of 27-28 Dist Bgre

Rayanna v Chief Secy & DC Bgre

App. F. III—21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Law File No. 66 of 1927

Serial No.

The District Judge Bangalore sends a Prohibitory notice in this Suit (O.S. 2 of 27-28) to be served on the Chief Secretary. This is issued on the application of the plaintiff for the issue of a temporary injunction restraining the defendants from interfering with the possession of the Chattram by the plaintiff till the disposal of the Suit. The hearing of the petition is posted to 3-10-1928.

Draft of a letter to Govt forwarding Copy of the notice is herewith put.

The original notice has to be signed by the Chief Secretary and returned to the District Court.

Secy) 27/7

27.7.28 27/7

CHIEF SECRETARY. 28 JULY 1928

27/7

30/7

Draft appd 30/7

21/7

To The D. J. Bangalore

Dy 1-8-28

Request to oppose the application

4

Draft of a letter to the Dist Judge, returning the original of the Prohi: notice after service on the Chief Secy's behalf for approval

13/8/28

13/8

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

SWD 61714—GPB—30,000—18-4-28

DS. 2067/28 Act Rice

General and Revenue Secretariat. Law File No. 66 of 1928

Serial No.	
5	To the Dr Inspr Banjara Dy No 1098 Dt 18.8.28 Returns the Original with the endorsement of Service
	Dy 18/8 This may be sent to the Revenue Branch for the linked file being taken by that Branch in connection with a Summons to produce documents received there.
	Dy 3.10.28 To the Revenue Branch for taking the linked file & returning this
	Linked file taken 3/10/28
	Law 3/10
	Revenue Dy 3/10/28
	To Dy 8/11/28

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPB—30,000—18-4-28

Civil

Form No. 105.

R 515

Bangalore

RECD. SECRETARIAT.

8 OCT 1927

MYSORE

From The District Judge's Court, Bangalore Division, Bangalore. Dy 1/10/1927.

To The Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore, Bangalore

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith Defendant Summons, in duplicate in original suit No. 2 of 1927/28 in the file of this Court, and to request, that you will be so good as to cause the duplicate to be served on the individual therein named, and the original returned to this Court with due endorsement of service thereon, on or before the date of hearing. ie 14.10.27

A sum of Rs. is herewith sent, being

witness batta

I have the honor to be.

Sir

Your most obedient servant. By order

Sheristedar

W D 0543--GPB—8,900—17-7-26

APP. F. VI. Gl.]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Immediate

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to.....418.....

Camp No. 13

To

The District Judge
Bangalore.

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
the 192

Date of issue.....11.10.1927.....

Signed by...Sri M.V. Iyengar...

Sir,

I am directed to return herewith the original summons with endorsement of service thereon ~~issued on the defendants in~~ ~~O.S.~~, in original suit no. 2 of 1927-8 on the file of your court ~~with a copy of the service report~~ read with your letter no. XX 575 of 1.10.27, I have etc

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

10/10/27

10/10

Secretary
H. Deptt

over

Camp. No 88
P

11th Oct. 1927

draft—

B.Nagappa, Esq-. Bar-at-law,

Law xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

by Dr. B.N

The Public Prosecutor,

Bangalore.

Rajamma alias Anantharamaiah
Chief Secy to G.

I have the honour to forward herewith defendants summons in O.S.No.2 of 1927-28 on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore with a copy of the plaint and to request you to take necessary action in the case in consultation with the Muzrai Commissioner.

Rajamma alias Anantharamaiah
Chief Secy to Govt.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Legal Remembrancer and
Secretary to Government,
Law Department

C. No. P 88A.

11.10.27.

Copy to the Muzrai Commissioner for information.

Bangalore
23-5-1928

From

The Public Prosecutor,
Bangalore

64

To

The Legal Remembrancer,
and Secretary to Government,
Law Department,
Bangalore

Sir,

Re: OS 2/27-28. on the file of the District Judge.
Plaintiff Rajanna alias Anantharamiah.

signed

I beg to send herewith the written statement in the above case drafted after consulting the Sub-division officer, for your approval and signature of the Chief Secretary and return. The statement may be typed after your approval for the signature of the Chief Secretary. The case is posted 1-6-1928 for filing the written statement into Court.

The connected records are sent herewith.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
your most obedient servant

Public Prosecutor,
Bangalore

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE BANGALORE

OS 2 of 1927-28.

Plaintiff.	Defendants.
Rajanna alias Anantharamiah.	1. Chief Secretary. 2. Deputy Commissioner.

Under Order VIII rule 1 C.P.C. the defendants above named beg to state as follows:-

1. The defendants emphatically deny the title to the Chatram put forward by the plaintiff in para 2 of the plaint and assert that the Chatram has from its inception been treated as a Muzrai Institution attached to the Sri Veerabhadradevaswami temple. The allegation of the plaintiff that it was buil by his forefathers out of their private funds is entirely false.

2. As a Chatram was found necessary to shelter the public, the defendants acquired at the instance of the villagers the land on which the Chatram stands from one Budan Sabi The plaintiff's ancestors were thereafter allowed to erect the Chatram for the use of the public after raising the necessary funds from the public. After its erection out of the public funds the Chatram remained attached to the Sri Veerabhadradavaswami temple has been kept open for the use of the public. The Chatram remained a Muzrai Institution and has been so treated in the Muzrai records. The plaintiffs claim to the Chatram is utterly untenable and baseless. The plaintiff asked for permission in 1921 to close the chatram with a compound wall and the 2nd defendant after enquiry intimated on 12-1-1922 to the plaintiff that the Chatram was a public Institution and as such that he ought to be evicted.

3. The contention of the plaintiff that the property was in the possession of himself and his forefathers for 70 years as alleged is untrue.

4. The 1st defendant is not a necessary party and the suit against him is not maintainable.

5. The suit against the 2nd defendant is bad as no notice of suit was issued to him and must therefore, be dismissed.

6. The order of the Deputy Commissioner in his capacity as Muzrai Officer directing dispossession was served on the plaintiff on 25-3-1922, as such present suit brought under section 20 of the Muzrai Regulation is barred under section 21 of the same Regulation and is therefore not maintainable.

7. The defendants pray that the suit may be dismissed with costs.

We, the above named defendants do declare what is stated above is true to the best of our belief.

Bangalore

A, P. F. VI. Gl]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No. 781(1)

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To The Public Prosecutor
Bangalore

Date of issue..... 1/8/28

Signed by..... M. N.S

Sir,

I have the honour to send herewith a copy of the prohibitory notice served on the Chief Secretary in O.S. 2 of 27.28 (Rajanna v Ch Sec'y & D.C., Bangalore) on the file of the District Court Bangalore and to ~~You are~~ requested you to oppose the application, the hearing of which is fixed to

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

over

WD 0325—GPB—30,000—26-5-27

A. P. F. VI. Gl]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Law

File No. 66.27

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. 1098(1)

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To The District Judge,
Bangalore

Date of issue 14/8/28

Sir,

Signed by

With reference to your letter No XX 1-2 dated 25th July 1928 forwarding a Prohibitory notice in O.S.2 of 27-28, I am directed to return the original with due endorsement of ~~service~~ service thereon

I have etc

for Secy to Govt
Law Dept

List of enclosures.....

Copied by

Examined by

over

WD 0325—GPB—30,000—26-5-27

Civil
Form No. 105.

44 127

CHIEF SEC. TRANSF. 26 JULY 1928

Bangalore
25.7.28

9 478/28

From The District Judge
Bangalore Division Bangalore 192

To The Chief Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
Bangalore

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith Pro: Notice

Summons, in duplicate in O.S. 180 2/27-28 No.

of 192 . in the file of this Court, and to request, that you will be so good as to
retain
cause the duplicate to be served on the individual therein named, and the orginal returned to this Court with due endorsement of service thereon, on or before the date of hearing.

A sum of Rs is herewith sent, being

witness batta

I have the honor to be.

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

N 2769 Law

WD 0543—GPE—8,900—17-7-26

Dy. Registrar
Subordinate Judge
Sheriff Cedar

A. P. F. VI. G1]

10

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No. 7077 Records

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To The Public Prosecutor
Bangalore

Date of issue 28/5/28

Signed by.....

Sir,

With reference to your letter dated 23rd may 1928 forwarding for approval the draft written statement on behalf of the defendants in O.S. 208 27-28 in the District Court, Bangalore, I am directed to return herewith the written statement duly signed by the Chief Secretary for being filed in court on 1-6-28

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

The connected records sent with your letter are herewith returned. I have etc

over

Legal Remembrancer

WD0325—G.P.B.—30,000—26-5-27

28/5/28

In the Court of the District judge, Bangalore

OS 2 of 27-28

Plaintiff

Rajanna
alias Anantharamiah.

Defendants

1. Chief Secretary
2. Deputy Commissioner

Under order VIII rule 1 C.P.C. the defendants abovenamed beg to state as follows:-

1. The defendants emphatically deny the title to the chatram put forward by the plaintiff in para 2 of the plaint and assert that the chatram has from its inception been treated as a Muzrai institution attached to the Sri Veerabhadraswami temple. The allegation of the plaintiff that it was built by his forefathers out of their private funds is entirely false.

2. As a chatram was found necessary to shelter the public, the defendants acquired at the instance of the villagers the site in which the chatram stands from one Budan Sabi. The plaintiff's ancestors were thereafter allowed to erect the chatram for the use of the public after raising the necessary fund from the public. After its erection out of the public funds

the Chatram remained attached to the Sri Veerabhadradevaswami temple has been kept open for the use of the public. The Chatram remained a Muzrai Institution and has been so treated in the Muzrai records. The plaintiff's claim to the Chatram is utterly untenable and baseless. The plaintiff asked for permission in 1921 to enclose the chatram with a compound wall and the 2nd defendant after enquiry intimated on 12.1.22 to the plaintiff that the Chatram was a public Institution and as such that he ought to be evicted.

3 The contention of the plaintiff that the property was in the possession of himself and his forefathers for 70 years as alleged is untrue

4. The 1st defendant is not a necessary party and the suit against him is not maintainable.

5. The suit against the 2nd defendant is bad as no notice of suit was issued to him and must therefore be dismissed

6.. The order of the Deputy Commissioner in his capacity as Muzrai officer directing dispossession having ~~been passed on one~~ was served on the plaintiff on 25-3-1922 the as such present suit brought under sec 20